

# OPINIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## OPINIONS 98 TO 104

### OPINION 98

#### BRAUER AND BERGENSTAMM

**SUMMARY.**—Rigidly construed, Brauer and Bergenstamm (1889 to 1894) did not fix the types for the older generic names, except in the cases where they distinctly state that the species mentioned is the type of the genus.

**STATEMENT OF CASE.**—Dr. Charles H. T. Townsend submitted the following case for opinion:

Friedrich Brauer and Julius Edlen von Bergenstamm published in the *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, from 1889 to 1894, an elaborate work entitled "Vorarbeiten zu einer Monographie der Muscaria schizometopa (exclusive Anthomyidae)," in four parts, comprising a total of 494 royal quarto pages and 11 royal quarto plates containing some 310 faithful drawings representing fully 300 distinct genera, the whole illustrating the authors' conceptions of the genera treated. This is a monumental work wholly unapproached in character by any work ever published on the Muscoidea. It treats the fauna of the world, giving the results of an exhaustive intensive study of external adult characters. The authors went as far as it is possible to go on external adult characters alone. Synopses of groups and genera embodying full diagnoses are given in both German and Latin. In each case the generic diagnosis is accompanied by one or more specific names, usually only one, and in that case immediately following the generic name, indicating the species which the authors employed to typify and illustrate their concept of a genus. In some cases the word type follows the specific name, but in most cases it is omitted. The word type, when it occurs, may in some cases be held as referring either to the type specimen of the species cited or the species itself in the sense of a genotype designation. In some cases the specific name immediately following a genus represents a species not originally included, but in a few of these cases an originally included species is also cited in or after the diagnosis, either following or preceding the generic name. It seems plain that in every case the intention of the authors, in citing the specific name or names, was to designate either the type species alone, or several typical species including the type species thereby fixing their conception of the genus.

The same authors published in the *Verhandlungen der k. k. zoologisch-botanischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, in 1893, a paper with exactly the same title as the

above, comprising 79 octavo pages, referring in a footnote to the three parts of the above-cited quarto work so far published at that time. In this work the authors gave synopses of the European genera and groups, in German, similar in plan to those given in the quarto work but in each case they preceded with the word "Type" the specific name. This paper is practically a repetition of the European faunal element in the quarto work.

It is plainly evident that the above quarto work was intended by its authors as a practically complete elucidation of the muscoid genera of the world known in collections up to that time, and it does in reality constitute such an elucidation. It is evident also that all possible consistent adherence to the generic concepts of this work will greatly advance the interests of muscoid taxonomy by facilitating the fixation of the numerous genera. If such adherence is not possible to obtain, certain genotype designations published subsequently to the above quarto work will hold, resulting in an entirely different interpretation of many of the genera treated.

In view of these facts, does the Commission rule that in all cases in said quarto work where a single originally included species immediately follows the generic name, the species in question shall be taken as the genotype; and that in all cases where the species immediately following the generic name is not an originally included species, the genotype shall be the first originally included species, if any, cited in connection with the generic diagnosis; provided in all cases that no conflicting valid genotype fixation had previously been effected?

DISCUSSION.—The foregoing case was submitted to Commissioner Karl Jordan for special study. At the meeting of the Commission in Budapest, August 30, 1927, he presented a verbal report discussing in detail the various documents involved.

He also presented the following written report:

In this work, which is preliminary to a more extensive work, the authors give diagnoses of all genera of these flies known to them. They quote behind the name of the genus usually *one* species, rarely *two*, and still more rarely *no* species. Nothing is said as to whether these species are meant to be examples or genotypes.

The genera should be grouped in three categories for the purpose of arriving at an opinion about the question "genotype" versus "example."

(1) New genera.—If only one species is mentioned, this must be accepted as genotype; if two are mentioned, one of them is the genotype.

(2) Old genera where a species is distinctly stated to be "Typus" of the genus.—In many cases B. and B. say "Typus," but it is clear that in these cases the addition of the word Typus means that B. and B. have examined the type [specimen] of the *species*.

(3) Old genera where one or two species are quoted without one of them being distinctly designated type of the genus.—In these cases the quoted species are merely "examples." In the later work, 1893, where for each genus a genotype is given, the genotypes are not always the same species as those quoted in the preliminary work under consideration; evidently B. and B. were not yet quite clear about the concept genotype when they published their preliminary studies.

In summary he found that, rigidly construed, Brauer and Bergensstamm did not fix the types for the older generic names, except in the cases where they distinctly state that the species mentioned is the type of the genus.

The findings were unanimously approved by the 8 Commissioners and Alternates present, namely: Apstein, Bather, Hartert, Jordan (K.), Muesebeck, Rothschild, Stejneger, and Stiles.

Later, the case with Commissioner Jordan's conclusion was submitted in Circular Letter No. 127 to all absent Commissioners. The final vote stands as follows:

Opinion concurred in by fifteen (15) Commissioners: Apstein, Bather, Chapman, Dabbene, Hartert, Horvath, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Kolbe, Loennberg, Neveu-Lemaire, Stejneger, Stiles, Stone, Warren, and two (2) Alternates, Muesebeck and Rothschild: Total 17.

Opinion dissented from by no Commissioner.

Not voting two (2) Commissioners: Handlirsch, Ishikawa.